

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
CENTRAL DIVISION**

|                                      |   |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b>C.R., et al.,</b>                 | ) |                                   |
|                                      | ) |                                   |
| <b>Plaintiffs,</b>                   | ) |                                   |
|                                      | ) |                                   |
| <b>v.</b>                            | ) | <b>Case No. 2:21-cv-04129-MDH</b> |
|                                      | ) |                                   |
| <b>MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL</b> | ) |                                   |
| <b>SERVICES, et al.,</b>             | ) |                                   |
|                                      | ) |                                   |
| <b>Defendant.</b>                    | ) |                                   |

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ pro se Motion for Default Judgment (Doc. 23) against Defendants Tiffanie Crouch and Brian Crouch (“Defendants”) pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b). Plaintiffs argue that Defendants, at the time the Motion was filed on August 19, 2021, had not properly served Plaintiffs with an answer to the Complaint nor filed a Certificate of Service with the Court despite having been properly served with the Summons and Complaint in this matter. Defendants were required to file a responsive pleading to the Complaint and serve Plaintiffs a copy on or before August 11, 2021.

Counsel for Defendants filed an Entry of Appearance, Answer to Plaintiffs’ Complaint, and Notice of Acknowledgment of Receipt and Summons and Complaint by mail on behalf of Defendants on August 10, 2021. Counsel for Defendants states that the failure to file and mail the August 10, 2021, Certificate of Service “was unintentional and an oversight”. Counsel for Defendants subsequently mailed the Answer and Certificate of Service to Plaintiffs and filed the same with the Court on August 23, 2021. While the Court acknowledges that Defendants failed to timely serve the Answer on Plaintiffs, because the answer was timely filed with the Court and

subsequently served on Plaintiffs, the Court finds that there has been no prejudice to Plaintiffs. Therefore, the Motion for Default Judgment (Doc. 23) is hereby **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: September 14, 2021

/s/ Douglas Harpool  
**DOUGLAS HARPOOL**  
**United States District Judge**